

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended, and new claims 14-15 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-15 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Examiner's Response To Amendment

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner stated that the Applicant's arguments filed August 13, 2003 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

In support of this assertion, the Examiner stated the following:

Adler teaches operating means for inputting two-dimensional data and for outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations (col. 18, line 64 to col. 34; col. 24, line 32 to col. 25, line 44). In other words Adler discloses a worksheet menu is provided in the pull-down menu field, which allows the user to manipulate the columns and rows that are displayed at any given time on the visual presentation. For example, the user may choose to display a particular row or column, even though the user also desires to scroll the cell field to previously undisplayed areas of rows and columns. Likewise, the user may decide not to display a particular row or column even though it falls within the area of rows and columns currently displayed in the cell field. Thus, Adler has the flexibility to manipulate one cell or numerous cells or an entire row(s) or an entire column(s).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of Adler. Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites:

A two-dimensional data processing apparatus comprising:
operating means for inputting two-dimensional data, and for outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data;
designating means for designating an operation type which specifies said operation by said operating means, and an input target and an output target of said operation;
recording means for recording at least one set of operation contents in the designated order of said operation contents, with the operation type, input target and output target designated through said designating means being one set of operation contents; and
activating means for sequentially reading out said operation contents recorded by said recording means, and for selectively activating one operation for said operating

means based on the operation type, input target and output target of said operation contents.

Therefore, one piece of two-dimensional data is output “after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data.”

This is in direct contrast to Adler, which discloses manipulating cells or particular rows or columns of a piece of two-dimensional data, rather than “an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data,” which indicates that the entire piece of two-dimensional data is subjected to the operation. The Examiner has cited choosing to “display a particular row or column, even though the user also desires to scroll the cell field to previously undisplayed areas of rows and columns.” Clearly, from the wording of this section of Adler, a particular row or column is being displayed or not displayed while scrolling through other rows or columns, rather than “an entirety of rows or columns” being “subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations.” Adler discloses a pull-down menu that allows the user to select functions that permit selected cells, or ranges of cells, to be deleted, moved, and/or copied to other cell locations (Column 19, Lines 6-16). Neither selected cells nor ranges of cells in a piece of two-dimensional data disclose “an entirety of rows or columns” of the two-dimensional data. The Examiner asserts that “Adler has the flexibility to manipulate one cell or numerous cells or an entire row(s) or an entire column(s).” However, “numerous cells or an entire row(s) or an entire column(s),” which implies one or more rows or columns that are a subset of a piece of two-dimensional data, is altogether different from the “entirety of rows or columns” recited in claim 1, which accordingly indicates the entire piece of two-dimensional data.

The Examiner has also cited Column 24, Line 32 through Column 25, Line 44 of Adler, which also discusses performing operations on a single row or column of cells (“As an example, the user, utilizing formula entry methods previously discussed, may desire to sum the objects in cells A1 through A5 and assign the result to cell A6.” Column 24, Lines 35-38). This allows a user to select a row or column of cells on which to perform an operation, at which point the range of cells will be listed in a reference-list notation that is passed to a scripting language so that an object engine can create the required dataflow dependencies (Column 25, Lines 31-44). There is no disclosure of operating on “an entirety of rows or columns.”

Further, this operation cited by the Examiner simply discloses a calculation in which the output will be provided as a single cell entry. In the example discussed in Adler, the objects in

cells A1 through A5 are added together, and the sum of the objects is output to cell A6. Rather than inputting two-dimensional data and performing an operation that will output one piece of two-dimensional data, as is recited in claim 1 of the present application, the disclosure of Adler in Columns 24 and 25 is to calculate a single value in a cell. Adler allows the operation results presented in cell A6 to adapt to different types of objects that are included in cells A1 through A5, but the configuration of the cells remains the same. Changing the configuration of the cells in the two-dimensional data would not be possible in Adler. This is in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application, which recites "the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data."

Also, since Adler is constituted to associate a formula with an individual cell into which a result is input, a calculation in which the number of cells varies as a result of the input two-dimensional data is not possible in Adler. This is also in direct contrast to the present application, in which the cells may be reconfigured either wholly or in such a way that the resulting piece of two-dimensional data does not include all of the cells that were included in the input two-dimensional data, depending upon the predefined operation that the input two-dimensional data is subjected to.

Therefore, Adler does not disclose "outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data" as is recited in claim 1 of the present invention. According to claim 1, the entirety of rows or columns of one or more pieces two-dimensional data are subjected to a predefined operation, and one piece of two-dimensional data is outputted which has a different configuration than the one or more pieces of two-dimensional data subjected to the predefined operation. In Adler, only particular cells or ranges of cells are operated on in a single piece of two-dimensional data. Also, Adler does not disclose changing the configuration of cells included in the input two-dimensional data in a single operation.

Accordingly, Adler does not disclose every element of the Applicant's claim 1. In order for a document to anticipate a claim, the document must disclose each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Adler does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Adler, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is once more earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Examiner's Note In Advisory Action Mailed June 10, 2004

In the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Action mailed on June 10, 2004, the Examiner noted that the Applicant's arguments regarding the fact that Adler did not disclose subjecting "an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data" to an operation had been considered but was not persuasive. The Examiner supported this assertion by stating:

Adler teaches an entirety of rows or columns when he discloses the cells being formed at intersections of the columns and rows (col. 15, lines 46-67). He teaches identifications of cells in columns or rows and the information is calculated based on the indications.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement by the Examiner. Column 15, lines 46-67 merely describe the basic layout and terminology of an electronic spreadsheet, indicating that individual cells are located at the intersections of the rows and columns of the spreadsheet. "It is to be appreciated that this method of identifying cells is standard in traditional spreadsheets and, thus, is employed to facilitate the spreadsheet user establishing a familiarity with the present invention" (Column 15, Lines 58-62). The cited section also states that the cells shown in Figure 1 of Adler are a small portion of the cells that can be displayed and manipulated by the electronic spreadsheet. However, noting that the spreadsheet is made up of cells, and otherwise describing basic spreadsheet functions, does not disclose "outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations." Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application patentably distinguishes over Adler.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In items 3-4 on pages 2-5 the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Adler.

Claim 1 recites "inputting two-dimensional data, and for outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data." Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Adler.

Claim 5 recites "inputting two-dimensional data, and outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional

data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data.” Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable over Adler.

Claim 9 recites “inputting two-dimensional data, and outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations, the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data.” Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentable over Adler.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and include all of the features of those claims plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by Adler. For example, claim 2 recites that the recording means records the operation contents as two-dimensional data. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 are also patentable over Adler.

Claim 13 recites “inputting two-dimensional data, and outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of the input two-dimensional data is subjected to one of a plurality of predefined operations; wherein the one piece of output two-dimensional data has a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data.” Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is patentable over Adler.

New Claims

New claim 14 is directed to a two-dimensional data processing method comprising:

“inputting two or more pieces of two-dimensional data;
selectively subjecting the two or more pieces of two-dimensional data to one or a plurality of predefined operations; and
outputting one piece of two-dimensional data resulting from the one of the plurality of predefined operations.”

Adler does not disclose “inputting two or more pieces of two dimensional data....and outputting one piece of two-dimensional data.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Adler.

New claim 15 is directed to a two-dimensional data processing method comprising:

“inputting two-dimensional data, and outputting one piece of two-dimensional data obtained after an entirety of rows or columns of said input two-dimensional data is subjected selectively to one of a plurality of predefined operations;
wherein the one output piece of two-dimensional data comprises a different

configuration or number of data elements from the input two-dimensional data.”

Adler does not disclose “outputting one piece of two-dimensional data....wherein the one output piece of two-dimensional data comprises a different configuration of number of data elements from the input two-dimensional data.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Adler.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended, and new claims 14-15 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration.

It is respectfully submitted that Adler does not disclose the present claimed invention. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, claims 1-15 are deemed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early notice of allowance are respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 09/15/04

By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501